

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-identified Application is respectfully requested. Claims 1-18 are in the case. No amendments have been made.

Regarding the rejection of Claims 1-10 and 12-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Gulick in view of Inoue, this rejection is respectfully traversed. Representative independent Claim 1 is directed to an audio amplifier electrical circuit, and recites, in pertinent part, “a power supervisory circuit that monitors the power used by the audio amplifier; and a volume control circuit that activates the volume control inputs when the supervisory circuit detects the power used by the audio amplifier is beyond a predetermined limit.” It was admitted that Gulick fails to teach a volume control circuit that activates the volume control inputs when the supervisory circuit detects the power used by the audio amplifier is beyond a predetermined limit. However, it was alleged that Claim 1 would be obvious by combining Gulick and Inoue. This allegation is respectfully disputed.

Inoue apparently relates to an audio amplifier, and teaches controlling the amplification factor of an amplifying section 3 based on a sound volume set-point value signal and input signal. Inoue is concerned with sound volume, not with the amount of power used by his amplifier, and thus sets his sound volume set-point value based on the value of a variable resistor 1. Thus, Inoue is completely silent concerning monitoring the power used by an audio amplifier, much less a volume control circuit that activates the volume control inputs when the power used by the audio amplifier is beyond a predetermined limit.

The other art of record is even less relevant.

Therefore, for the above reasons it is respectfully submitted that Claim 1 is allowable over Gulick, Inoue and, indeed, all of the art of record, whether considered individually or in any combination. Independent Claims 5 and 12 contain similar limitations to those discussed above in connection with Claim 1, and so are allowable as well for the same reasons. Claims 2-4 depend from

Claim 1, Claims 6-10 depend from Claim 5 and Claims 13-17 depend from Claim 12, and so are all allowable as well for the same reasons, as well as for the additional limitations found therein. Wherefore reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Regarding the rejection of Claims 11 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Gulick in view of Inoue and Okamoto, this rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 11 depends from Claim 5 and Claim 18 depends from Claim 12. The reasons for the allowability of Claims 5 and 12 over Gulick and Inoue are set forth above. The patent to Okamoto fails to cure the deficiencies of Gulick and Inoue, having been cited merely for teaching a resistor to insure a voltage drop to a pre-determined limit when the audio amplifier draws current which approaches a limit. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that for the above reasons Claims 5 and 12 are allowable over Gulick, Inoue, Okamoto and, indeed, all of the art of record, whether considered individually or in any combination. Claims 11 and 18, depending from Claims 5 and 12, respectively, are allowable as well for the same reasons, as well as for the additional limitations found therein.

It is respectfully submitted that the claims recite the patentably distinguishing features of the invention and that, taken together with the above remarks, the present application is now in proper form for allowance. Reconsideration of the application, as amended, and allowance of the claims are requested at an early date.

While it is believed that the instant amendment places the application in condition for allowance, should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned in order to expeditiously resolve any outstanding issues.

To the extent necessary, the Applicants petition for an Extension of Time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136. Please charge any fees in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees to the Deposit Account No. 20-0668

of Texas Instruments Incorporated.

Respectfully submitted,

/J. Dennis Moore/

J. Dennis Moore
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 28,885

Texas Instruments Incorporated
P.O. Box 655474, MS 3999
Dallas, TX 75265
Phone: (972) 917-5646
Fax: (972) 917-4418